

Remarks

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Office Action dated October 11, 2001.

The above amendments and remarks to follow are intended to be fully responsive thereto.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 28 and 29 under 35 USC § 103 as being anticipated by Mockridge in further view of Take, Helmstetter and Drajan. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Take, Helmstetter and Drajan fail to disclose "a shaft securing portion formed adjacent to said heel wall and **extended from said top portion to said sole portion...**"

The prior art granted to Take discloses **two** shaft support portions 73, 75 used to position the club shaft which fail to extend from the top portion to the sole portion of the golf club head in combination with cushioning members 81 and 83. See column 5, lines 10-13. The cushioning members 81, 83 are placed between the shaft and the shaft support portions 73 and 75 so that the cushioning members 81, 83 extend beyond the terminal end of the shaft supporting portions 71, 73. Take expressly states in column 4, lines 37-40 that the "**portion of the shaft 29 disposed in the club body 45 is not supported around its entire periphery by a peripheral wall...** integral with the head body 21." Emphasis added. Removing the cushioning members would destroy the intended purpose of Take.

Regarding Helmstetter, here again the tube 36 has an internal orifice 42 that opens to the interior shell; the orifice 42 provides an entrance to the interior shell for the addition of a foam material 18. Column 3, lines 56-61. Making the shaft holding portion a unitary member without an orifice in Helmsetter would destroy intended purpose of the invention.

Regarding Drajan, the prior art discloses a hosel comprising a smaller tube 26 and a larger tube 28. As can be seen in Figure 1, the hosel here again does not extend from the top portion to the bottom portion as the present application. Further, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Drajan to make the shaft holding portion more rigid. Drajan specifically states the annular space between the tubes is filled with an elastomeric substance to act as a shock absorber. Increasing the rigidity of the club head would undermine the intent of Drajan. The Examiner also states that it would have been obvious to homogenously form the club head of Drajan. Drajan specifically states that the sole plate is removable to be interchanged with other sole plates. This allows a golfer to change the weight of their club head. Thus forming the club head as a homogenous body would similarly destroy the intended purpose of Drajan.

Because of the aforementioned arguments, rejection under 35 USC § 103 is improper.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 29 which depend from independent claims 1 or 28, the rejection of these claims are moot, in light of the Applicant's arguments above.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Endo in view of Take, Helmstetter and Drajan. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Here again, the references cited by the Examiner fail to disclose a shaft securing portion "extended from said top portion to said sole portion." The arguments recited above again apply to the modification of Endo in light of Take, Helmstetter and Drajan. Thus, rejection under 35 USC § 102 is improper. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 16 depend from base claim 1, thereby making the Examiner's rejection of these claims moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 13 and 20 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Mockridge in view of Take, Helmstetter, Drajan and Minabe. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 13, 17 and 20 depend from claim 1 which is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Mockridge in view of Take, Helmstetter, Drajan and Motomiya. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, which the applicant believes is in condition for allowance, thereby mooting the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Mockridge in view of Take, Helmstetter, Drajan and Mills. Claim 19 depends from claim 1, which the applicant believes is in condition for allowance, thereby mooting the Examiner's rejection.

Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Matthew W. Stavish
Reg. No. 36,286

Dated: July 17, 2002

MFJ/wwm
Liniak, Berenato, Longacre & White
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Tel. (301) 896-0600
Fax. (301) 896-0607